

Walla Walla District General Comments:

- I concur with the progress made over the last months and in the direction USACE is headed with the processes provided.
 - I believe that the focus of any effort to establish a foundation in PMBP across USACE should be on the PM and PDT where work is planned and executed. That being said, 11 of the 21 processes deal directly with the PM and PDT producing work. As a minimum there are three critical subjects that should have processes for a PM to be able to produce work at the PDT level. Those are PMP Development, Work resourcing, and project financing. These are generally addressed in 11 of 21 processes provided for review.
 - Also believe that the focus of each separate process should be on the steps in each process and not on "who" within an organization is executing those steps. The processes provided are all over the "map". Some are generic and generally allow the organization to identify who should be executing the defined step in the process. Others, like Work Acceptance are much too specific when identifying specific people in a District to execute a step.
 - Last general comment is that many of these processes identify boards and roles & responsibilities at specific organizational levels that are not currently practiced in NWW or NWD. Not sure if these processes should be the vehicles to establish new procedures or requirements at the organizational level.
- In closing, I am encouraged with the progress made since I reviewed the original 26 processes. Believe we are headed in the right direction.

Response: Thanks for the support. This is a living document and will be continuously modified as needed. You will find that many modifications have been made as a result of the time and effort of reviewers like yourself.

Why nothing for O&M too big of a Program to ignore. PMBP Development team will address. Based on the PMBP flow chart, Project delivery flow chart.

Response: O&M will be included ... ABS will be either incorporated or interfaced.

@ Very complex processes

@ Sustainability cost of massively integrated AIS. Can we and our customers afford this? Does anyone know what the cost will be to have all this data.

Response: This is a general business process manual which establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. The efficiencies that will be realized by this effort will cause the cost of business to decrease in the future. For example, single point data entry, elimination of data calls, elimination of redundant AIS systems, etc.

I have reviewed the CBP. It is voluminous, but I think it is well-intentioned and will be a handy resource for all of us as to processes, etc. Looks like the RWG's have done a good job. I believe it will meld well with the processes we have already identified and flow-charted within our own organizations. If used to the extent possible, it will force us to better consider sponsor input, risk, PMP development, budget - the entire gamut of

what we do. The CBP seems more geared to our CG, GI and SFO work as opposed to O&M; hopefully, when we see the WBS's it will become clearer. I don't know how much time it may take to keep the "beast" fed with data, particularly for our PMs. It will take some getting used to, but my impression is that this is a positive step for the Corps. It's like our QA/QC emphasis; it may seem like an additional burden at first, but its value becomes more apparent the more you implement it.

Response: Thanks for your positive comments. We have revised the manual to be more generic and are working on more detailed information for the Program-specific document. O&M processes will be included and ABS will be incorporated or interfaced. The intent of this manual is to establish a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. The corporate business practices established by this manual will enable P2 (and "enterprise" system that will eventually tie all corporate AIS together) to make data available at all levels since there will be a "consistency" in where data is found and how it is used. Also, the goal is to eliminate data entry duplications and to eliminate numerous data calls and information requests.

I have scanned the subject document. Emphasis on "scanned". Other than being one of the poorest organized documents I have ever reviewed, I have no comments. (Note – reviewer examined early version of manual, from web.) I believe we have spent enough time commenting on this subject over the past 12 years. If I remember correctly, the last time we reviewed this process, NWD sent forward over 500 comments which for the most part were ignored. I feel it is now time to implement this process and cut out the discussion. I feel it leaves adequate flexibility for all reasonable people to work through implementation to suit each of our unique needs. The real problem will be in the details which NWW is now working vigorously to accomplish.

Response: Thanks for your time and effort. You will find that many modifications have been made as a result of the time and effort of reviewers like yourself. Your perception is correct. This is a general business process manual which establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. It does not address activities that do not require consistency across USACE. There are levels of work in the district below the level of this manual. There was no attempt to dictate how work below the line would be accomplished.

There seems to be an excessive number of District processes for the PM to provide active involvement, not to mention those designated for the Program Manager to enact. Is it the PM's first duty to prosecute these processes, or to ensure that a quality product is produced on time and within budget? The assumption that following process will lead to a quality product may not be true. Especially when the process activities draw off the resources needed for the product development.

Response: PDT is to deliver a quality product on time and within budget per the ER 5-1-11. This manual is intended to be the implementing guidance for the ER. This is a general business process manual which establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. This should not expand upon the PM's duties.

The nature of the Automated Information Systems needed to implement this PMBP appear to be monstrous. Has this system been tested (proto-typed)? What is the cost to

bring this on-line? Are there no current systems that can be used? How long and how much will the training cost to implement?

Response: The off-the-shelf softwares for the P2 have already been purchased. The P2 application is being developed based on the USACE Business Processes that are now being finalized. The system acceptance test and initial operating capability is planned prior to P2 roll out. There will be an entire curriculum associated with familiarizing all personnel with the PMBP and the USACE BP manual. The curriculum will provide an opportunity for individual learning about the Business Process and the P2 automated information system through a series of self-study CD sessions followed by small group discussions and formal training classes. These sessions will emphasize both the cultural changes desired and how to use the automated systems.

All of these processes must provide value-added, or in other words, will the customer be willing to pay for them? If these processes do not provide value to the product then the customer should not be expected to pay for them. (NOTE – HQ needs to address.) If templates are first created to provide the minimum requirements, then the PM can use them to build-up to the required processes, instead of starting with the maximum requirements and then downsizing. Templates need to be sent to the field for review.

Response: Agree. Please note that the customer is a member of the PDT. Emphasis has been provided to the customer as an active and key member of the PDT in determining scope and quality for project execution. Various templates are being developed now and will be sent to the field for review.

Litigation, personnel issues and other legal matters do not fit readily into a structure for advanced scheduling, work breakdown estimates and the like. Significant clarification is needed to address these and other issues of "Support Service Organizations. Should be addressed under a Program Management Plan.

Response: Agree. The processes for the "support service organizations" will be addressed in phase II.

Seattle District General Comments:

There are at least three different things trying to happen in the draft PMBP manual. One is defining the functionality of managing individual project time and cost that will be coded in P2. The second is taking PMBP to the next level and rolling in advanced functions like workload management and acquisition planning. The third is expanding both the project and the program management functions beyond traditionally defined "projects" to "all work." The first effort answers an urgent need. The second is important to the future of the Corps but does not need to be tied too closely to the first. The third in my opinion needs to be approached very cautiously least we impose expensive processes with no value added.

Response: This BP Manual is intended to facilitate implementation of the ER mandate to manage all work within the corporate AIS. The level of detail required is dependent on the size and complexity of the project. In addition, future and unknown work will be

entered at the highest organizational level (least amount of detail). See PMP Content/Level of Detail.

What we need in P2 is a relatively simple, robust AIS that tracks project time and cost. It needs to work well enough and be easy enough to use that project managers will in fact take the time to feed it their data. This is the most immediate task, and we should be careful not to jeopardize it by being too ambitious. Why does this same software have also to do program management, civil works budget formulation, civil works fact sheets and acquisition planning?

Response: A major purpose P2 is to reduce data calls necessary to perform program management. This will only be achieved if P2 is used to manage all programs/projects.

It's too much to take on at one time. Get the project management software right, and use flow charts and "soft" links to tie it to the other processes.

Response: The development team was charged by Corps leadership to integrate AIS systems used to develop programs.

To hard code in this system such specialized, advanced functions as regional work leveling is risky and unnecessary.

Response: All information for this activity will come from day-to-day management of programs and projects in P2.

The business process mapping and the computer programming are related tasks, but they not congruent. I'm afraid that by getting too ambitious on the business process piece we'll fail on the project-tracking piece. Although I understand the idea behind the bullseye chart with ER 5-1-11 at the center, in reality P2 will be a hard center, too, because once it is fielded it will be very difficult to change. The flow charts and doctrinal regulations of the business process are comparatively easy to alter from year to year.

Response: Use of COTS, in conjunction with the business processes, should minimize the risk of this happening.

For the last twelve years, PMBP has been about getting districts to do work in PM-led customer-focused teams. That journey is not finished, yet we are taking on a new set of objectives related to regional workload management. Strategic workload management is a worthwhile process that needs to take place, but I suggest that we establish a separate computer system from P2 to do it. Workload forecasts are fuzzy data, while project funds are hard figures. Project management takes place on a different time frame than does strategic workload management. In many cases different people are involved. It doesn't make sense to make workload management decisions on individual projects as described in the proposed Work Acceptance Flowchart. These are program decisions that should already be in place so that when individual projects come in the organization is ready to take them on. Making the project management and the program management systems distinct does not mean they have to be disconnected, but it allows them to be optimized separately and prevents problems in one system from hurting the other.

Response: The P2 system needs to allow sufficient level of detail to perform programmatic versus project and workload management.

Why do we feel compelled to develop a theory of everything? Why does P2 need to be the system that does it all? The PMBP is a powerful model for delivering products and services, but there are many functions in USACE that do not fit well under the PMBP model. "All work, regardless of funding source, will be managed with P2." Do we really mean this? How about Regulatory, non-project real Estate, and routine water project operations? These actions are already tied to multiple AISs, including CEFMS, RAMS II, REMIS and (soon) FEM. What is the value added of shackling them to P2 as well? (The time spent in feeding these AISs is expensive and must be worthwhile.) Probably none, and we probably don't intend to. So if it's not all, let's not say "all."

Response: The purpose of P2 is to provide a centralized database that will allow single-point data entry with corporate data exchange with interfaced AISs. Integration with AISs will only occur where greater efficiencies and savings can be achieved.

Miscellaneous comments:

Regional Advanced Acquisition Strategy. What is broken that this is trying to fix? Who is going to staff this Board? Since the people are most likely to be District contracting staff, how will we justify pulling them away from their jobs for this? What is the value added that justifies this additional expense? Since all the functions described for this Board (identifying needed capabilities, balancing resources to meet contracting goals, meeting customer needs) are currently the responsibility of districts, how can we say that performance of these functions by a regional Board is not usurping district functions? Why do we believe that managing acquisition at the regional level will be better than managing it at the district level?

Response: Chief of Engineers has directed a more regionalized approach to contract management and charged MSCs with this responsibility.

If we are going to have models of project-specific information for military, civil and HTRW projects, it probably would be worthwhile to have a similar model for Support for Others projects under the Chief's Economy Act or the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act.

Response: BP team is looking at the SFO program.

I'm still confused over what we are trying to accomplish with regionalization. There is plenty for divisions to do with the four traditional functions of Command and Control, Regional Interface, Program Management and Quality Management. Cross-leveling work between districts should be a possible but a rare event. One reason districts are project funded is so that they can expand and contract with the work, not from month to month as does an AE firm, but over years as we see programs coming and going. Districts are successful organizations because they bring different disciplines together in project teams that establish long-term relations with customers and deliver products and services to them. The proposed Work Acceptance Flowchart throws all this out and directs that districts make accept/decline decisions on each individual project. This is a

huge departure that in my view will greatly undermine customer relations and service. Don't take my word for it: go ask a customer how they would feel if they approach District A with a project and get told that they have to get served by District B located 500 miles away. There is a place for strategic decisions about making program shifts from district to district, but these are to be made by district and division leadership with a long-term view, not by outreach coordinators. Also we probably can achieve efficiencies by forming cross-district teams, but that is done after work has been "accepted."

Response: We've entered a new era where we need to utilize Corps resources to the fullest extent and cannot afford to duplicate unnecessarily. Shortage of needed expertise is overcome by our ability to select Virtual PDT members from any geographical location

The Oracle Tutor part at the beginning was quite confusing but it probably isn't necessary for the average manual user to know about the tutor.

Response: Oracle Tutor is just a reference. It will facilitate the understanding of the format used in this document.

Where do SFO projects fit into this as they are not mentioned? Are there any unique requirements for these type of projects?

Response: SFO is being considered.

I have big picture concerns about the message we are sending to the workforce. We talk about the PMBP and how it is designed to give us flexibility and agility to adapt and to be "empowered". Having processes standardized and defined to a great level of detail appears inconsistent with the PMBP direction. This dichotomy needs to be rectified by lessening the detail prescribed (perhaps by using above and below the line requirements) as well as by explaining how these processes are to give us greater flexibility - i.e., facilitate doing business across district boundaries; and with that, better and seamless service to our customers, etc.

Recommend that the processes be screened by a set of criteria that define what we are trying to achieve and those processes that support those criteria (thus facilitating our work in the PMBP and enhancing our ability to serve our customers), be standardized and be done so to an appropriate "above the line" level of detail. Care needs to be taken that the Project Managers, Program Managers, Resource Providers etc. do not end up burdened with process and systems, and instead their work be facilitated and made more efficient and effective. We need to remember that this is not just about a manual of processes for us to use as a reference document in doing our work - this manual constitutes the processes that will populate P2 and become the system that PM's will use to manage their work.

Response: Per ER5-1-11, the PDT is empowered. This manual is the implementing document for ER 5-1-11 and addresses general business processes that establish a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities – a consistency necessary to readily and efficiently share and execute work among various USACE elements. It does not address activities that do not require consistency across USACE. There are levels of work in the district below the level of this manual. There was no attempt to dictate how

work below the line would be accomplished. These should be covered by local SOP's. Technical requirements are addressed by specific technical regulations and manuals.

The P2 will enable these processes. P2 is an "enterprise" system that will allow data to be viewed and entered by members of the PDT irrespective of their geographical location.

The name of the manual is PMBP Manual - - - a mixed message. We have been talking about PMBP as a doctrine that consists of important culture shifts in our way of doing business as defined in the ER. These include changes in roles, role relationships, and principles we operate by in the team environment. Processes are a part of this but are only a piece of the puzzle. Processes alone will not create the PMBP culture. Calling the process manual the PMBP manual sends the message that defines the PMBP as processes. Without the parallel work on behaviors, expectations, roles, attitudes, etc., the goals of PMBP will not be achieved. This is a lesson we have learned from previous change initiatives.

Recommend the name of the manual be Business Processes Manual. This may seem a minor point, however, language and the importance of consistent use of terms and building shared organizational understanding is critical. Without the shared understanding and common vision we will not succeed with the PMBP.

Response: Thanks for the insight. There will be an entire curriculum associated with familiarizing all personnel with the PMBP culture and the USACE BP manual.

An index of topics at the end of the manual will assist in quick finds of certain subjects.

Response: The BP will review and respond.

General Comment: Bottom of all pages: "Copyright Oracle Corporation, 2000. All rights reserved." Question copyright - I don't think so.

Response: Reworded. See Master Document.

As the NWS lead on our Quality Mgmt Plan, I was recently reviewing EIG report dtd May 2000 on "QM in the PMBP." In looking at the portion of the PMBP Manual on Quality System and QMP, I didn't see where the EIGs recommendations related to Continuous Process Improvement were incorporated, especially the part of Plan, Do, Check and Act. It appears to me that the EIGs finding that current regs "do not thoroughly address and emphasize the Check and Act phases of quality management" still applies to the draft PMBP Manual. The QMP piece of the PMBP Manual continues to be product or deliverable focused and fails to address the "analyze the process" piece, thus resulting in a Plan-Do-React way or producing products per the EIGs comments.

Response: The BP team will review and respond. There have been numerous changes to the manual to better incorporate quality objectives. Lessons Learned is a continuing activity as required by the Change Management process. Dr. Checks is currently being evaluated for its potential use in the USACE lessons learned process.

Summary Comment on PMBP Manual and P2. The PMBP Manual is a deeply flawed document because it is confusing, not easy to follow, not user friendly, poorly organized,

too systems oriented, too complicated, and has unrealistic expectations. In addition, P2 creates a whole new approach to both project management and program management that places a heavy burden on already overworked Project Managers (PMs) and Program Analysts (PAs), especially for civil works, who already have the time-tested and critical budget/funding process using PRISM. Please do not eliminate the PRISM database. While I have always fully supported the concept of a single database/AIS for all Corps work, there has to be an easier way of getting corporate project management data (and leaving corporate program management data to PRISM), or the cultural shock of PMBP/P2 deployment and implementation on project execution and staff retention could be devastating.

Response: All PRISM functionality will be incorporated into P2. All current PRISM functionality and reporting will not be lost. CW specific processes will be further refined and developed.

Style of PMBP Manual. The PMBP Manual appears to have been written in a manner that supports what HQUSACE needs, not what a P2 user in the field, specifically the PMs, can realistically do while also managing and executing the projects. This is especially true for the Civil Works Program and Budget Process. Please SIMPLIFY and SHORTEN the PMBP and PMBP Manual with a refocus on what the PM in the field needs to manage and execute his/her projects in the field.

Response: This manual is written to implement the ER5-1-11 ... and is a general business process manual which establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. The BP team will further review and refine CW specific processes.

Table of Contents. Expand the incomplete Table of Contents so it includes all the details shown in the Process and Document Index. And for each heading in the Table of Contents, also include the appropriate PROC, NAV, or REF number; and you could even add a list of all the PROC, NAV, and REF numbers at the end of the Table of Contents. These changes will help the user better understand the report structure and more easily find the cross references.

Response: This is being done.

Missing Subjects. The Manual does not adequately discuss execution (paragraph 23 on page 65 doesn't even come close), reprogramming of funds during the current FY (not discussed), creation and updating of Current 2101 (not discussed), and cost sharing on real time basis (not just during project closeout with CEFMS in paragraph 9 on page 139).

Response: The BP team will further review and refine CW specific processes to incorporate all current PRISM functionality.

Civil Works Program and Budget Process. See response below.

(1) Format. Why was this process broken into 5 separate sections, with much of the first 1½ pages of text in each section being repetitious? This is very confusing – one

section is enough, but it needs to be better organized so PMs, DPMs, and DEs can understand it.

(2) Staggering New Approach of P2. The burden being placed on the PMs and PAs to produce things in P2 is staggering – at least 8 “budget versions”, 6 “project versions”, and 26 products/reports are mentioned in the Manual – and some critical ones are missing from the Manual, like 2101 Current budget version, 10-year program (grunt sheets), and work allowances for initial and reprogrammed funds. While there is a table on page 204 explaining the project versions, please add a table explaining all the budget versions. An expectation that PMs and PAs will do all these things and still be able to manage and execute their projects is unrealistic.

(3) Civil Programs Portion Is Not Busted. Somehow through skill and experience we do all the Civil Programs stuff now, with budget/funding documents done separately by PAs in Civil Programs using PRISM and project-level information from PMs. In other words, the Civil Works Program and Budget Process works very well now through use of the PRISM budget/funding process even if PMs don’t have good detailed project scope, schedule, and cost data. The PMBP will change this process to link project and program data all together so that all budget/funding data MUST now come from budget/project versions in P2 created by the PMs. I predict this will destroy our time-tested and critical budget/funding process, at least in the short term.

(4) Do Not Eliminate PRISM Database. Until we have confidence that PM project data is in P2 and is good enough to support the complex budget process, please do not eliminate the PRISM database (see page 210 of Manual).

(5) “Under Development”. With so many parts of the Specific Civil Works Program Reference Document still “under development” (O&M ABS, WBS, milestones, templates, comment field definitions, etc. on pages 207-209), it’s impossible to provide comments. I hope that all the good work that went into PROMIS on these things “under development” is being carried forward into P2.

Suggestions for Improvement. While the PMBP Manual and P2 have serious problems, we must find a way to get the PMs willingly and successfully using P2. I offer the following suggestions for improving the process:

(a) Do not eliminate PRISM, thereby eliminating the need for all the “budget versions” in P2 and protecting the time-tested and critical budget/funding process.

(b) Transition into P2 for a year or two or three, focusing on what the PM in the field needs to manage and execute his/her projects in the field (scope, schedule, and cost), while also getting only the essential corporate project management data into P2.

(c) Throughout, insist on very strong leadership at all levels within the districts promoting P2 and its use by management and the PMs.

(d) Then, only if the new system is working well at all project management levels, consider adding the program management portion and all the “budget versions” back into P2 to test if they are a viable alternative to the PRISM database.

Response: Thank you for your time and effort. The BP team will further review and refine CW specific processes, especially to incorporate all of the current PRISM functionality ... programming, budgeting, 2101, reprogramming, etc. You will find that many modifications have been made as a result of the time and effort of reviewers like yourself.

Portland District General Comments:

In the manual events or tasks are referred to by a numbering system i.e. PROC1022 or REF 1018. Where is this numbering system described? How does this number system relate to the process. If it is to be a quick guide it is not hitting the mark.

Response: This is being taken care of.

In the task write ups they refer to a number "Go to task #8" Does the tasks number line up with the paragraph or line number in the write up? Yes If it relates to the logic network then need a task number shown per event in the network. Need the network up front so as to understand the flow of logic, not at the end.

Response: Thanks for the comment. This is the Oracle Tutor format. This is being looked at.

Flow diagrams are good, just need them up front not in the back.

Response: Front or back shouldn't make a difference (Tutor format).

The term Resource Providers is used in the second to last paragraph on pg 23. Not sure of the meaning of this term as it is used here. Is it consistent throughout the manual?

Response: Yes, used consistently.

The regulations are referenced but no titles are given only a website. Agreed, recommended titles be added to manual. Suggest title is included or create a master listing like you have done for acronyms. Response: This is being taken care of.

The term "earned value" is used on page 14. I do not understand the term. What is the intent. Response: A reference document will be included to define the term “earned value” and explain the intent of its use. Use of earned value principles will improve our ability to manage project execution and is considered a best business practice.

A BP/P2 office is reference throughout the manual. Is it the intent for each District to create such an office if we do not have one? No – HQUSACE level. If we accomplish the function of the BP/P2 office in other ways is that OK? Districts need the flexibility to

organize to execute not be told how to execute. **Agree.**

1) Is the manual intended to be prescriptive or can Districts merely use it as a guide? 2) How can the manual be implemented now if it's joined at the hip with the deployment of P2. I understand P2 isn't scheduled to be deployed until early in the FY03. 3) There are several new actions prescribed in the manual for the RMB's. Are these prescriptive or can the RMB's pick and choose what they want to implement? **Response: This is a general business process manual which establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities and is not intended to replace existing technical activities and requirements. The business processes should be implementable independent of the tools ... tools (P2) will be designed to support the business processes.**

In general, I am concerned about the prescriptive nature of the manual, if in fact the manual lays out requirements and not just guidelines. I realize that some standardization is important among projects and among Districts throughout the Corps, but such standardization should be held at the highest, macro level. While I realize that part of the manual is designed to assure that our processes support consistent data entry, every effort should be made to make the processes supportive of project teams and not an unnecessary burden for upward reporting.

Response: This is a general business process manual which establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. It does not address activities that do not require consistency across USACE. There are levels of work in the district below the level of this manual. There was no attempt to dictate how work below the line would be accomplished. Upward reporting is intended to be a byproduct of the PDT's day-to-day actions.

Having not gotten through a detailed review of the document, one specific comment comes to mind. I am hopeful that the manual is not calling for the development of new organizations such as the BP/P2 Program Office. Some discretion should remain at the field level to determine where best within existing structures the called for functions will be best performed. Again, back to my general comment, I recommend that flexibility is provided in terms of the who and how as long as the basic intent is carried out.

Response: This manual prescribes general business processes that establish a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. This manual will be flexible enough to accommodate the local SOPs, governing regulations, and decisions made by the PDT. The BP/P2 Program Office is changed to Configuration Management Board which will reside at the HQ.

Under 41 USC 601 and case law, Contracting Officers are the ultimate decision -makers for a host of contract-related matters. The draft manual doesn't state this anywhere.

Response: The BP team will review and respond.

Under AFARS 5101.602-2 (c) (i) Legal Participation, "legal counsel shall participate as a member of the contracting officer's team throughout the acquisition process." The draft manual doesn't state this anywhere either.

Response: Per local SOP. This manual is not intended to replace existing technical activities and requirements.

The draft manual does discuss acquisition processes in several places, without sufficiently recognizing the role of both Contracting Officers and legal counsel:

Response: The BP team will review and respond.

Somewhere in each of these sections, it needs to be stated:

"Contracting functions are assigned to Contracting Officers, assisted by technical and legal advisors, by law and uniform federal regulations. Consequently, the Contracting Officer, the Contracting Officer's Representative(s), other assigned Contracting Division staff, and technical and legal advisors to the Contracting Officer are automatically part of the project delivery teams for all projects involving contracting activities."

Response: Contracting actions should be discussed with the team prior to implementation. The PDT includes Contracting Officer, COR, and legal counsel. The BP team will further review and respond.

The following statement ought to be inserted in the preface.

"Civil works project disruption due to litigation over environmental compliance, endangered species, archeological and historic preservation, and tribal rights is a very frequent occurrence. All potential civil works projects at the outset and during their performance should be carefully coordinated with legal counsel to minimize and avoid such litigation to the maximum extent practicable."

Response: Project team should work this out.

This is a very detailed document that is very complex for people to effectively and efficiently use to deliver projects. I think a more simple approach without all the detailed steps that meets everyone's requirements would be a lot more effective.

Response: This is a living document and will be continuously updated as needed. Please provide us with your ideas for incorporation.

AIS- We need some effective reports that are easy to obtain that meet the requirements of effective product/project delivery. Existing reports have a financial focus.

Response: Agree. The team is working on reports.

AIS- So far from what I've seen, whenever we try to develop one system that meets everyone's needs, it becomes so burdensome that it doesn't work effectively. For example, having detailed resource data in PROMIS is difficult. This talks about capability, constrained, and planned versions. To manage those schedules at the level of detail required for resource leveling is going to be incredibly time consuming and not effective in delivery.

Response: This is a living document and will be continuously modified as needed. You will find that many modifications have been made as a result of the time and effort of reviewers like yourself. Please provide us with your ideas for incorporation.

The format discussing OWNERSHIP/RESPONSIBILITY on each process is redundant and confusing to me.

Response: Oracle Tutor requires this format.

Overall I think the concepts are good, but the steps are too specific and done without a good understanding of project management at the operating district level.

Response: Thanks for your time and effort. Please help us by recommending a better way.

In my review of this document it appears to be a "cookbook" or "cookie cutter" approach for all RMB, BMO, Program Manager processes in the Corps, promotes the use of P2, with out alot of real direction.

Response: Thanks for your time and effort. Please help us by recommending a better way. Please note that the goal of this manual is to establish a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities.

The Manual also appears to have stipulated structures that are not currently in place in most districts.. Would this mean that it would require organizations to restrucutre themselves to meet the requirements established in this document?

Response: If necessary.

General: The Manual seems complete even though it is very comprehensive and prescriptive. Its extensive cross references to other procedures make it a detailed useful tool while creating a difficult document to read and follow. The step-by-step numbering and associated flow chart for each component are a good combination as they provide both a narrative and a pictorial understanding of the process being addressed. However, it will be vital to enhanced understanding and implementation that the user make a significant initial effort to absorb the specifics of each component.

Response: Thanks for your time and effort. Incorporation of many comments has improved the PMBP Manual.

This is an impressive, although somewhat overwhelming document. The idea that the ..."Manual provides the foundation for execution of all work accomplished by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers" (p. 12, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY) and that " All work, regardless of funding source, will be managed with P2....having a single point of data entry" (p. 14, PREFACE) is an ambitious undertaking. However I think the document attempts to accomplish these goals in the right manner by utilizing a consistent format in each section of the manual (Scope, Policy, Responsibility, etc.). The specific roles and responsibilities for different individuals (PM, PDT member, etc.) at the end of each section will also be helpful in clarifying those issues and providing for consistency between projects and among different project managers.

Response: Thanks for the support.

I have mixed feelings and some confusion over the PMBP Manual. It is a manual. This means that the detailed processes must be absorbed into the employees' work ethic when performing their function for the organizational unit to which they are assigned. This must be done after much study and complete understanding of the processes described in the Manual. I am unable to give detailed comments from only scanning the Manual at home, in the night, away from the press of mission work.

Response: The key to real understanding will be in the PMBP curriculum being developed. This will provide an opportunity for individual learning about the business process.

I understand that my role in providing legal services to the PMBP in the district is that of a "Resource Provider". The scope and extent of such services is highly dependent upon many factors such as the magnitude and complexity of the project, the range of stakeholders whose interest in the project are in conflict with each other, and the knowledge and experience of the Project Development Team members. We, in the Office of Counsel, stand ready to support the PMBP in whatever form it takes to accomplish the work on time and under cost to meet the needs of district customers.

Response: Thanks for the support.

I will need a briefing from the developers of this Manual in order not to guess on how I am to provide legal services to PMs and others. The Manual alone is not written in a way that I can create a vision of the whole work effort. This is a manual that provides detailed, step-by-step guidelines on how to conduct a project management activity and measure its execution.

Response: This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. The level of detail required is dependent on the size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects.

That said, I continue to support Attorney John Breiling's earlier comments on reinforcing counsel's role in the acquisition management planning and execution. For example, Counsel must be named as a recognized functional participant on the Advance Acquisition Planning Board (pp 74-77) and Regional Advance Acquisition Planning Board (pp147-150). Acquisition strategy cannot take place in a vacuum. Legal sufficiency is a critical element of all acquisition planning. Without legal involvement in the planning, the strategy is incomplete at best, and may be illegal at worst.

Response: The BP team will review and respond.

I did like the emphasis throughout the document on acquisition planning, especially as a key item in all PMP's and QMP's.

Response: Thanks.

It's obvious that much thought and work have gone into the production of this manual. It is very detailed and, to a large extent, very prescriptive in methods, processes and procedures.

Response: Yes. Thanks.

As with any prior version of ER 5-1-11, the Corps continues to struggle with trying to define common processes and procedures to fit everything we do, most notably routine, day-to-day operations and maintenance activities of our projects. This PMBP Manual is no exception. The indications are throughout the manual, but no place more evident than on page 15, where there is a large void within the flowchart box titled "Operations and Maintenance Phase."

Response: Yes, good observation.

Where there are notations of using automated systems -- namely P2/P3e -- to manage all work, I note that the automation "work horses" for O&M are FEM and ABS. FEM is new and ABS is not going away any time soon. These are "legacy systems" for which interfaces with P2/P3e are being designed to cover the routine and budgeting aspects of O&M work. In cases of larger non-routine O&M work, which have clearly defined scopes, schedules and budgets, P2/P3e will serve the purpose. With the point being single point data entry, we need to be very careful how we define prescriptive or required processes and procedures in O&M and design the interfaces so that desired data can be pulled from these legacy systems without double data entry. Where that may not be possible, we need to make a hard decision on whether or not we really need that data that cannot be retrieved through automated means.

Response: Thanks for the comment.

I believe that there will be great struggles to develop standard project templates and Work Breakdown Structures for universal use across the Corps. As evidence, that has been an issue with development of FEM because it is very clear that our districts across the nation look and act very much differently in many respects.

Response: We are trying to get them to act somewhat the same.

In order to perform all the resourcing analysis/evaluation as envisioned by this manual, it will take a very long time to reach the point where all are trained, knowledgeable and functioning in the automated systems. The same people doing "day work" would be the ones having to input the data, manage it, keep it current, etc. Viewing the experience of MAXIMO, which is a very powerful automated system, it has taken several years of evolution to have much data put into the system and effectively utilize the many features of that software. Hope we don't hypothetically decide to implement on Friday and expect full functionality on Monday. It will not be a seamless process.

Response: Yes. It's a journey. The data should be the same data a PM needs to manage the project.

Given the short time to review the manual and my recent travel schedule, I have not had an opportunity to read it thoroughly. However, my initial thoughts are that this is an exceedingly comprehensive and complex document. It appears to be very prescriptive in directing how work will be performed which will likely stifle creativity, at least to some extent. If we are expected to comply with the letter of the manual, and not just the intent, it will probably require that many of the processes we have developed and proven to be effective for this District will have to be rethought.

Response: This is a general business process manual which establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. It does not address activities that do not require consistency across USACE. These should be covered by local SOP's. Technical requirements are addressed by specific technical regulations and manuals. There are levels of work in the district below the level of this manual. There was no attempt to dictate how work below the line would be accomplished.

The processes seem to have been developed with P2 in mind. If so, many of them will probably be useful in helping us integrate P2 into our routine work.

Response: Yes

Based on past experience and the complexity of the manual, I fear that it will not be a "living document" that is continually updated to reflect process improvements, incorporate lessons learned, etc. I suspect that it will be relegated to a shelf and rarely, if ever, opened.

Response: It is a living document, and changes will be looked at on a recurring basis.

I would question whether the labor demands that the processes in this manual will place on an organization have been considered. Again, to follow all these processes will be a significant burden.

Response: In the short term yes, but we believe in the long term the Corps will be more efficient.

Flow chart, they appear to be very well thought out. Thanks.

Overall, I like the manual, this will have an impact on our work processes.

Response: Thanks for your support.

Omaha District General Comments:

My understanding is this manual reflects best business practices in the processes contained therein. My concern is that different practices prevail in the different mission areas of Civil Works, Military Construction, Regulatory activities, HTRW, etc. I am not sure just how accommodating the Manual is with respect to framework and flexibility.

Response: The basic processes for all programs are similar, and they are flexible for the different program requirements. Also, program specifics will be addressed under program specific references.

I have a concern that the document doesn't recognize the difference's between Project Management and Contract Management.

Project Management, as defined in the USACE Business Process, lays out the corporate trail we will follow from the time a project is identified through delivery. However, it also speaks to how we identify and use the talents of our people irrespective of our

organizational home and how we are to communicate with each other and with the customer from the inception to the completion of a project. In short, the USACE Business Process is more than just a process. It is intended to instill a corporate culture of respect for individual team member's roles and responsibilities as we endeavor to provide quality products and services for our customers. That is good. Concur.

Response: Thanks for your support.

Contract Management, on the other hand, is a narrowly defined process which the Government (in this case the Corps of Engineers) must follow as stewards of public \$\$\$. We have a great deal of flexibility in applying the principles of Project Management in our day to day activities. In the Contract Management arena we are governed by laws that often restrict our flexibility. These two management principles can/do frequently create pressure points within the PDT; particularly between the Project Manager and team members whose behavior is often driven by rules, regulations and public law. I am specifically referring to our Administrative Contracting Officers (ACO's). Because of this inherent conflict, we need to assure that any process defined in the USACE Business Process Manual recognizes ACO responsibilities. Specifically I am referring to change order and contingency management. We will be doing a great disservice to our customers if the ACO hasn't been given the resources and flexibility to make quick decisions on essential technical changes or cannot timely consummate a modification because we have built a bunch of "mother may I's" into the process.

Response: Disagree. The ACO must work with the team before the contractor.

The construction process as related to Resident Engineers and Contracting Officers or ACO's is already well defined in existing policies and procedures. This manual is not intended to replace existing technical activities and requirements. However it does define the interaction of the PDT, Communication Plan, etc. that will work throughout the life cycle of the project.

Bottom line - We must guard against building a process that is so restrictive for the Contract Managers (ACO's) that there is the potential for negatively impacting project costs and/or schedules and/or our costs of doing business.

Response: This process is not restrictive.

Recommend that the USACE Business Process require that ACO responsibilities be recognized and clearly outlined in Project Management Plans (PMP's).

Response: This is a good idea. Maybe the roles could be outlined in the district's QMP.

The Mandatory Centers of Expertise should be included in the Project Management Business Process. The following language is suggested:

“Twelve Mandatory Centers of Expertise exist within USACE. They are vital resources needed for the execution of various missions. These CXs are integral to USACE's core capabilities and play important roles in the execution of all types of work. Each center has a unique charter and maintains the highest level of expertise in their area. Their functions range from quality assurance reviews to technical assistance and include guidance development and support of HQ

USACE. Their inclusion in the process is required (or mandatory) for the program that they support.”

Response: CXs are not excluded. They are a resource to be used by the team.

Project Management Plan – Technical Assistance, Project Support, and Technical Review activities by Mandatory Centers of Expertise should be included in the plan. These activities would impact schedules, budgets, and resources.

Response: Agree. Reviews etc. must be in the PMP.

HTRW Program Screen – has yet to be developed. This screen should include review requirements for the HTRW-CX. It should also include optional services available from the HTRW-CX. Reference should also be made to the Technical Project Planning process found in EM 200-1-2. The HTRW-CX is available to assist in the development of this screen. Please contact us.

Response: Templates are under development. Your request will be passed on to the team.

Desk Manual Reference – Centers of Expertise are not mentioned.

Response: CXs are not excluded. They are a resource to be used by the team

Resource Provider – the Centers of Expertise should be included as resource providers. Subject Matter Experts are available as resources for projects.

Response: CXs are not excluded. They are a resource to be used by the team

Team Establishment – resources at the Centers of Expertise are frequently considered members of the project delivery team. This consideration should be included in this section.

Response: CXs are not excluded. They are a resource to be used by the team

I strongly support common business practices across the Corps. We must be more successful bringing together the technical capabilities across the Corps, and some commonality of how we do business within each district is essential if we are to work “virtually”.

Response: Thanks for your support.

The overall process of planning our work, including resourcing to the Section level, is very good. As a major resource provider, I have great need to perform workload analysis and leveling. Currently, Engineering Division has a total of about 275 people, and we are left to manage those resources with only general information on future workload, and little ability to perform workload analysis and resource leveling, except for some systems we’ve developed ourselves. Since our own systems are not common throughout the Corps, or even the District, we struggle getting project managers to develop and input data into these systems. Implementation of the proposed Project Management Business Process would resolve this major problem.

Response: Agree. Thanks for the insight.

Although I am very much in favor of the proposed approach, we must guard against trying to do everything through this system. We went down that road with PROMIS. I was initially on the Field Review Group, so I am very familiar with development of PROMIS. Other than agreeing on one AIS (P3e), and doing the resourcing within the AIS, the goals and methodology of P2 are almost exactly the same as PROMIS. We must be more successful this time.

Response: Agree. We believe this system will be a tremendous improvement.

Agreeing on one AIS (P3e) was a good step. This will significantly reduce difficulty in programming P2.

Response: Thanks for your support

Doing resourcing within the AIS is great—PROMIS was going to do workload analysis and resource leveling separately because of the multitude of AIS's across the districts.

Response: Thanks for your support

Integration with other systems, particularly CEFMS, is essential. We cannot afford to do business in an environment that requires double, triple, or more entries and maintenance of the same information.

Response: Agree. We are looking at single data entry.

My staff reviewed the website from the standpoint of resource management and CEFMS, and gave the site a thumbs up all around.

Response: Thanks for your support.

This is to confirm my initial comments to you and add a bit. First of all, I support both the concept and the document, as it exists today. I think the effort by all involved is solid. A large number of folks from all levels of the Corps put a great deal of time and effort into this, and the result is certainly comprehensive in scope. As I indicated earlier, there are two issues that I continue to come back to in considering this document. The first is that it will provide consistency across Districts and Divisions. That alone is worth the price of admission for this effort. The second is that I understand the guidance to be sufficiently flexible that a small project will be judged on a different threshold than will a large project. I see the existing guidance as a bit prescriptive, but we can soften the level of prescription over time, as the model becomes the standard way we execute our tasks. It is imperative, as I see it, that the model is used in all that we do -- that will require a shift in culture in some elements of the organization such as G&A offices and Operations. It is also critical that we advertise our early successes using this guidance because there are a large number of folks in the Corps who will be hesitant to embrace this shift in culture unless they see the value in clear terms.

Response: Thanks for your support, comments, and insight.

Kansas City District General Comments:

Things the manual does well:

- Manual provides detailed process framework in flow chart format that puts rigor into the process. This is a necessary evil when trying to link complex human interaction to AIS.
- The manual is thorough, capturing all of the steps in a project's lifecycle.
- Format is consistent; though this is expected given it's supposed to operate on-line.
- The diagrams, particularly the one listed on page 15, help clarify the main points.

Response: Thank you for your positive comments.

Things the manual does not do so well:

- Manual does not establish a "culture of customer focus" (page 13 of 231). On the contrary it establishes a culture of process focus. The attention required to follow all of the steps may in fact, compete for customer attention.

Response: Emphasis has been provided to the customer as an active and key member of the PDT in determining scope and quality for project execution. Based on your comments and those of others many improvements have been made in this area.

- The manual does not adequately describe Project Workload Analysis and Resource Leveling (page 23 of 231) and Command Workload Analysis and Resource Leveling (page 155 of 231). The description of Project Workload Analysis doesn't explain how the workload is determined short of a resource loaded project schedule, nor does it describe what resources are being leveled – Dollars? Labor by type/skill? Both? Further, the manual states the BMO will analyze workload and advise the RMB on District workload-related problems. Commanders ought to be included in that process somewhere. Preferably, they'd have a shot at fixing the problem before the issue reached the RMB.

Response: Reworded – see Master Document

- Manual could identify PMP content better with the use of a simple diagram showing the hierarchy of PMP, QMP, Communications Plan, Change Management Plan, Risk Management Plan, etc.

Response: Intend to add required Plans to initial flowchart.

General Comments.

LTG Flowers told the recent DCC class the purpose of this drill was to get senior leader buy-in. I'm not sure this drill will achieve that end, but from where I sit we ought to give this a try. I'm in favor of bringing process consistency to USACE.

Response: Thanks for being open minded.

=

Some of the processes are too complex depending on the project. This will drive PMs and PDTs to ignore the item because it may not be construed as added-value plus they are under many pressures to execute. We need to attempt to determine how these will assist us in achieving high quality projects on schedule within budget that delight our customers. If they aren't doing that, then this becomes just an exercise. Having said that, I would agree that a change in our way of doing business is necessary and these will help to bring the team together to discuss key issues better than previous methods have. These will help change our culture. Thus, we should proceed on with these (as revised by the comments received) and then ensure we have some feedback system to re-evaluate them and revise them accordingly.

Response: This is a general business process manual that establishes a corporate level of consistency by all USACE activities. The level of detail required is dependent on the size and complexity of the project. That doesn't change the overall process required to get there, but many individual steps will be streamlined for smaller/less complex projects. Also, this is a living document and will be continuously modified as needed. You will find that many modifications have been made as a result of the time and effort of reviewers like yourself.

=

I applaud the efforts of the team who has prepared this manual, job well done. It has taken us (Corps) 12 years to come up with a document which will have buy in Corps as private industry has been using this process for more than 15 years.

Response: Thanks for the support.

Executive Summary: PMBP initiative mandated by Regulation no. ER-5-1-11 involves five separate initiatives. Recommend Capable Workforce Initiative (CWI) be included as sixth initiative in ER-5-1-11 even though it does not tie directly with PMBP similar to S&A Pilot Study Initiative. CWI involves assessing workload, manpower and workplace culture (soft skills). Success of PMBP is keyed to the culture of our organization and CWI is the process to identify gaps in workforce culture and develop actions to fill the gaps in culture. CWI will enhance the success of PMBP. NWD Districts have implemented CWI and has proven useful. Quite a few other Districts are in the process of implementing CWI. The Chief, LTG Flowers supports this initiative and only way to assure the consistency of this initiative is to include in ER-5-1-11.

Response: We will look at this and bring it to the ER 5-1-11 team.

Preface: Clarifies Roles: Second paragraph makes a mention of using CWI by resource providers for planning resource requirements. Suggest a proper emphasis be placed on utilizing CWI, as this process will enhance the culture needed.

Response: This is a living document and will be continuously modified as needed. As your comments indicate, the use of CWI as a resource planning tool is mentioned in the manual, and the level of emphasis in the PMBP manual and ER-5-1-11 will be further evaluated.

=

On the whole, I found the Manual straight forward. Each step or process is relatively easy to follow, but I found it difficult to move from one process to another. As an example, under each process, there is a “System Reference,” but I found it difficult to jump to the referenced processes because there is no clear pagination or identification for each process. I suggest clearly identifying the process number at the top of each page or, as a minimum, on the first page of each process.

Response: Recommendation accepted. The final product will include navigational tools to aid the user.

As an attorney, I was surprised to find no direct reference to lawyers, attorneys, or counsel. The word legal is used only twice in the Manual (based on a word search). I believe the value added by legal advisors justifies a more concrete inclusion in the process. Perhaps the supporting regulations and policy memoranda meet this need, but I have not yet cross-walked those references.

Response: Legal advisors as well as any other support staff elements should be considered in the formation of the Project Delivery Team based on the needs of the project.

=

Outreach coordinator should coordinate work with branch chiefs team which will recommend a PM to the DPM for assignment. PM then should coordinate with resource providers and acquisition strategy board.

Response: Accepted

Within the district the outreach coordinator should be primary interpreter of Thomas Amendment requirements.

Response: Accepted

The high and low triggers in workload analysis should be completely within RMB control and be flexible enough to accommodate district strategic planning. Quarterly measures may be unrealistically short given the CPOC/CPACs inability to respond quickly to varying manpower needs. Workload analysis bands should be set utilizing productivity-based measures rather than use-based measures.

Response: Manual suggests general guidelines. RMB has flexibility to modify triggers to take into consideration local factors and workload trends.

Primary responsibility for resolving project resourcing issues should be with the middle management team (in Kansas City the Branch Chief Team) rather the district corporate board.

Response: Delegation of this responsibility to a district middle management team is acceptable within the general business process guidelines.

Maintain the reference to proprietary software Dr. Checks (p 134) as the primary lessons learned repository. Processes for utilizing lessons learned should be noted by reference to page 82 (PDT responsibilities in the PMP development section).

Response: Accepted

=

NWD Division General Comments:

GENERAL: I applaud and commend the work that has gone into developing this manual. It covers new ground, ground we needed to cover to advance Corps efforts to better accomplish our mission and serve the nation through customer focus and continuous improvement. We must recognize what we have and what we don't have with this manual. What we don't have is a USACE SOP. This manual should not be promulgated as proscriptive for compliance. What we do have is doctrine (an authoritative guide) refined in detail for institution wide implementation. This manual is the equivalent of a mission-training plan (MTP). Units in the field refer to the mission-training plan for guidance but further develop and in special circumstances deviate from the MTP. Units (divisions and districts) should develop their processes to further clarify and refine from the USACE base, just as tactical units don't operate from an MTP, but develop SOPs to augment doctrine and provide the framework for operations (processes) at unit level. I also understand that some in the Corps would disagree with this premise. They want the manual to be promulgated as and received as proscriptive, intending to "fix" USACE by strong central direction.

Response: Thanks for your intuitive review of this manual. This is consistent with the Chief's views. Has to be prescriptive for data consistency

While the manual is comparable to an MTP, MTPs have training and evaluation outlines for each task that includes subtasks (process steps) and standards (metrics). Development of some standards and metrics would greatly enhance the value of this manual, especially metrics that commit higher to lower support of project teams in their delivery efforts.

Response: We have been charged to develop metrics and training will be provided.

Following are my general observations and specific comments to the Project Management Business Process Manual and the review process. First of all, I believe we have a process in place within the NWD to assure all have the opportunity and the encouragement to participate in this critically important review process. The intent of this phase of the overall initiative is to assure we have commonly defined processes so we can develop a single automated data base and operating system to satisfy the project development, organizational management and reporting requirements. The processes included in the manual are comprehensive and most importantly, the above/below the line bar is placed high enough to allow innovation at the production level and adequate standardization for reporting at all levels. It is also important to note that the increased formality, structure and documentation will increase the cost of executing our projects significantly, at least in the short term. This should reduce the total project cost in the long term.

Response: Concur, we believe the long term benefits will outweigh the short term effects.

There has been a lot of successful work accomplished to bring this document to this near-final stage of development. I believe this manual is a quality product. I fully concur with the statement on page 12 that this manual provides the framework for execution of those product-oriented processes, while providing flexibility to adjust local procedures to meet mission requirements to (it is not too prescriptive).

Response: Thanks for your support.

Regulation Titles - throughout the manual there are hyperlinks to USACE and other government websites that contain regulations/guidance. The regulation references are by number only - most of the time you don't know what subject the regulation addresses. For example, on page 17, there's a link to ER 37-1-26, under the heading Policy. The regulation addresses project orders, but you can't tell what the subject matter by looking at the hyperlink. Suggest that titles be added to all hyperlinks.

Response: accepted

Establishing Policy Through the PMBP Manual - in some instances there is new USACE policy being announced via this manual. One example is the area of accrual s, pp. 185-188. Is the intent of this manual to prescribe both policy and procedures, or just procedures? If policy is going to be addressed, will the corresponding regulations be updated to reflect the new/revised policy?

Response: Just procedures. The accrual document has been deleted.

Kudos to the team that put together such a good quality document that provides the guidance on CBP, at the same time, it is flexible enough to suit different projects and conditions.

Response: Thanks for your support

Let's go with this document after incorporating the comments rather than extending the schedule for perfection. It is a living document and can be fine-tuned as necessary in the future. At present, an 80%-90% solution is better than not having any.

Response: We are on a tight schedule and will proceed.

Having read the subject manual, my initial thought was this "system" appears to be taking on a life of its own versus being a tool to help the project manager and team provide quality projects/products on time that meet customer expectations. On second thought, the detail provided does appear to serve as an excellent "how to" guide for new PMs and team members.

Response: To be successful the process has to be a tool for the PMs and PDTs.

As resource providers, team members, and sometime PMs, the systematic approach detailed in the manual should assure that all offices/divisions are aware of their responsibilities and provide a vehicle for encouraging/mandating teaming.

Response: Thanks for your support.

Based on Real Estate's experience with the Real Estate Management Information System (REMIS), utilization of system features appears to be directly related to the scope of the

project and the size of the organization. For smaller offices and/or projects, the amount of detail required to manage many of the projects and resources is minimal. As a tool, P2 must allow flexibility by minimizing mandated actions and providing templates that may be used dependent upon the scope of the project.

Response: We believe the templates and milestones have the necessary flexibility.

For the military program, four Real Estate Activity Templates (page 213) have been established. Neither the CERE Real Estate Board Automation Information Systems Committee (RE AIS) which I chair or the CERE IT support staff have seen these templates so it is impossible to comment on their reasonableness at this time. The Committee has requested copies of the templates for review/comment.

Response: We will pass this on to the team.